

Application No.: 09/381,996
Amendment Dated: July 5, 2006
Reply to Office Action: April 5, 2006

MTS-V03175US

Remarks/Arguments:

Claims 4-28, 30-45, 47-49, 53-57, 59, 63-65 and 68 are pending in the above-identified application.

Claims 4-6, 22-26 and 28, 39-45, 47-49, 53-57, 59, 63-65 and 68 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being obvious in view of Tsukamoto et al. and Kori. Claim 4 is amended to include,

...said encrypted contents key is deleted, **while leaving the encrypted digital data**, if the encrypted contents key satisfies a predetermined condition. (Emphasis added).

Basis for these amendments may be found in the specification at page 68, lines 13-21. With regard to claim 4, neither Tsukamoto et al., nor Kori disclose or suggest deleting the encrypted contents key while leaving the encrypted digital data. Tsukamoto et al. and Kori are described in the previous response. At page 37 of the Office Action, the Examiner asserts that "it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to selectively erase the video program or the key-encrypting key to prevent the user from accessing the A/V data." As described in the previous response, the user management key in Kori restricts the user to use the A/V data. Kori however, does not disclose deleting the user management key while leaving the A/V data. In contrast, the present invention deletes the encrypted contents key while leaving the encrypted digital data if the encrypted contents key satisfies a predetermined condition. Applicant's claimed feature of deleting the encrypted contents key while leaving the encrypted digital data is advantageous over the prior art because if the key was deleted, the user can watch the same content again by purchasing the corresponding key again without having to acquire the content again.

Because Tsukamoto et al. and Kori do not disclose or suggest the features of claim 4, claim 4 is not subject to rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) in view of Tsukamoto et al. and Kori.

Application No.: 09/381,996
Amendment Dated: July 5, 2006
Reply to Office Action: April 5, 2006

MTS-V03175US

With regard to claims 39, 53 and 68 claims 39, 53 and 68, while not identical to claim 4, include features similar to those set forth above with regard to claim 4. Thus, claims 39, 53 and 68 are also allowable over the art of record for reasons similar to those set forth above with regard to claim 4.

The other references cited by the Examiner also do not disclose or suggest deleting the encrypted contents key while leaving the encrypted digital data. Claims 5-28 and 30-38 depend from claim 4. Claims 40-45 and 47-49 depend from claim 39. Claims 54-57, 59 and 63-65 depend from claim 53. Accordingly, these dependent claims are also allowable over the art of record for at least the same reasons as their independent claims.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, this Application is in condition for allowance which action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,


Lawrence E. Ashery, Reg. No. 34,515
Attorney for Applicants

DFD/fp/dmw/ds

Dated: July 5, 2006


P.O. Box 980
Valley Forge, PA 19482
(610) 407-0700

The Director is hereby authorized to charge or credit Deposit Account No. 18-0350 for any additional fees, or any underpayment or credit for overpayment in connection herewith.

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail, with sufficient postage, in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on:

July 5, 2006

Deborah Spratt



fp/4290